

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-51 are pending, Claims 17, 22, 23, 29, 30, 35, 40 and 47 having been amended by way of the present amendment. Support for the amendments to each of these independent claims is found in the present specification, for example at page 15, first paragraph, describing the CPU reading the electronic mail successively one line by one line and judging whether a command character string is contained. Therefore, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 17-34 were rejected as being unpatentable over Blake (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0031465) in view of Kang (U.S. Patent 5,543,933); Claims 35-51 were rejected as being unpatentable over Blake, Hemmi et al. (U.S. Patent 5,552,833, hereinafter Hemmi), Kang and in further view of Lawler et al. (U.S. Patent 5,585,838, hereinafter Lawler).

The undersigned appreciatively acknowledges the courtesy extended by Examiner Brown by holding a personal interview with the undersigned on October 13, 2009. During the interview, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed the single reference in Blake to e-mail (see Blake [0093]). As discussed, the undersigned argued that Blake does not explicitly teach that an e-mail is transmitted to a user's reception device and as a consequence the user reception device cannot extract the various control commands from an e-mail message, as claimed.

Consistent with what was discussed in the interview, each of the independent claims has been amended. Claim 17, as amended, requires that the reception device have means for receiving an electronic mail and means for controlling. The means for controlling judges whether a character string in the electronic mail is a control command, and when a control

command is judged to exist in the electronic mail the means for controlling checks for at least one of a reservation command, a cancellation command, and a confirmation command.

Blake, on the other hand, as was discussed before, mentions e-mail once. However, Blake does so in the context of a user logging onto or telenetting to an account connected to a central processing system 334 to make his or her selections [0093]. In addition to logging on or using telenet, the user may also send recording requests via e-mail to an account connected to the processing system 334 [0093]. Thus, the single reference to an e-mail in Blake is referring to a user sending an e-mail to an account for the processing system 334, to make selections. The processing system 334 then presumably send some other kind of control signal to a recording device. Blake is simply not descriptive on this point.

As such, comparing amended Claim 17 with Blake, amended Claim 17 requires that the reception device for controlling a recording module actually includes means for receiving an electronic mail. In contrast, Blake does not describe the reception device for controlling the recording module as receiving an electronic mail. Instead, a user sends a recording request via electronic mail to an account of the processing system 334. The processing system 334 is separate from the recording device as shown in Figure 13. Furthermore, Claim 17 requires that the means for controlling, which is part of the reception device, judges whether character string in the electronic mail is a control command. Blake simply does not teach or suggest this feature. Instead, Blake relies on a user to send an e-mail to a processing system 334. Blake merely describes that the recording device 336 is turned on at an appropriate time but provides no description regarding how the recording device is turned on. Moreover, there is no description in Blake regarding the recording device receiving an e-mail that contains a control command, as claimed.

As discussed in the interview, each of the rejections of the pending claims is based on Blake as being a primary reference. However, as discussed above, it is believed that Blake

does not disclose all the elements, namely receiving an electronic mail at the reception device, for example, or judging whether a character string in the electronic mail is a control command, as claimed. Thus, even if the secondary references disclose what the Office Action purports that they disclose, those disclosures do not cure the deficiencies with regard to Blake as discussed above. Consequently, it is respectfully submitted that no matter how Blake is combined with the secondary and tertiary references, the combination does not teach or suggest all of the elements of independent Claim 17, or any of the other pending Claims 18-51, as amended.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments it is respectfully submitted that Claims 17-51, as amended, is patentably distinguishing over the prior art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.



Bradley D. Lytle
Registration No. 40,073

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/09)